UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,104	01/23/2006	Henry Daniell	10669-040	6977
⁷⁹²²⁹ Timothy H. Vai	7590 05/13/201 n Dvke	EXAMINER		
390 No. Orange		KUBELIK, ANNE R		
Suite 2500 Orlando, FL 32	801		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1638	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/520,104	DANIELL, HENRY	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	7 time 1t. Itabelik	1000	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 07 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	n the same day as filing a Notice or replies: (1) an amendment, affidar eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	f Appeal. To avoid abar vit, or other evidence, v e with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a	ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili	ng date of the final rejection	on.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex	(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 tension and the corresponding amoun	136(a) and the appropriat t of the fee. The appropria	e extension fee ate extension fee
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing d		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	o avoid dismissal of the	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NC		cause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	tter form for appeal by materially re		he issues for
NOTE: New issues; The amendments to the spenditioned. See MPEP 201.11 and 37 CFR 1.78. (cification to correct prioity cannot	-	rection must be
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	21. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		, timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6, 13-25, 33-49, 51</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and 			
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		in condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Anne R Kubelik/ Primary Examiner, Art	Unit 1638	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

112, 2nd:

Applicant urges that the sequence identifer is not necessary because the sequence of IFNa2b is well known, as Reichert et al was used in the prior Office action. This is not found persuasive because more than one protein is called IFNa2b (see Reichert et al, US 5,460,956, column 2. lines 43-47).

103 o

Applicant urges that the recitation of a transcriptionally active spacer overcomes McBride in view of Reichert. This is not found persuasive because the claims would be rejected over McBride in view of Reichert and further in view of Daniell.

Applicant urges that McBride does not enable interferon expression in chloroplasts. This is not found persuasive because this is why Reichert was cited - Reichert teaches an interferon sequence. Using the teachings of the cited art, one of skill in the art could construct a chloroplast transformation vector encoding this interferon and transform chloroplasts with the vector. As Applicant did not have to do anything special to get interferon to be successfully expressed in plastids, and as McBride and Daniell expected that human pharmaceutical proteins could be successfully so expressed, one of skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant urges that Daniell cannot be applied as prior art because of the correction of priority. This is not found persuasive because a correction of priority must be petitioned, as discussed above.

Applicant urges that the amendments to claim 1 obviate the rejection over McBride in view of Reichert and further in view of Maliga or Chandrasegaran or Conkling and Aycock or Rathinasabapathi. This is not found persuasive because the rejections would simply be modified to include Daniell.